IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

RICHARD D NICHOLS 3161 W HAUER DR NE NORHT LIBERTY IA 52317 9520

SIEMENS INDUSTRY INC C/O TALX UCM SERVICES INC PO BOX 283 SAINT LOUIS MO 63133

APPEAL 21A-UI-24833-S2-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

APPEAL RIGHTS:

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the mailing date below the administrative law judge's signature on the last page of the decision, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

- 1) The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
- 2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- 3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

ONLINE RESOURCES:

UI law and administrative rules: https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-law-and-administrative-rules

UI Benefits Handbook: https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-claimant-handbook Employer UI Handbook: https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployer-handbook

Report UI fraud: https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/report-fraud

Employer account access and information: https://www.myiowaui.org/UITIPTaxWeb/ National Career Readiness Certificate and Skilled Iowa Initiative: http://skillediowa.org/

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

RICHARD D NICHOLS

Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-24833-S2-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

SIEMENS INDUSTRY INC

Employer

OC: 08/29/21

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quit

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the October 22, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a determination that claimant failed to perform satisfactory work. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 7, 2021. Claimant Richard D. Nichols participated. Employer Siemens Industry, Inc. did not participate. Department's Exhibit D-1 was received. Claimant's Exhibit A was received.

ISSUES:

Is the claimant's appeal timely? Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time as an account executive from December 1, 2019, until August 31, 2021, when he was discharged.

On August 31, 2021, claimant was discharged for failing to meet sales goals. Claimant frequently spoke to employer about the tools he needed to meet his goals, as they were impossible to meet under the currently guidelines. Claimant had extensive sales experience and knew what would make both he and the company more successful. On several occasions, he asked employer to expand his territory and lower the margins. Employer declined and eventually ended his employment.

A disqualification decision was mailed to claimant's last known address of record on October 22, 2021. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by November 1, 2021. The appeal was not filed until November 4, 2021, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant did not receive the decision in the mail until November 3, 2021. Claimant immediately contacted lowa Workforce Development

and was told to file an appeal. Claimant filed an appeal the next day. Claimant testified he does not usually have trouble receiving mail and he was regularly checking his mail.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue is whether claimant's appeal is timely. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes it is. Iowa Code section 96.6(2) provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary guit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive evidence of the date of mailing. *Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.*, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); *Johnson v. Bd. of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. The Iowa Supreme Court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representatives' decisions within the time allotted by statute, and that the administrative law judge has no authority to change the decision of a representative if a timely appeal is not filed. *Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979). Compliance with appeal notice provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. *Beardslee v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also *In re Appeal of Elliott*, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982). The question in

this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. *Hendren v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

In this case, the claimant did not have an opportunity to timely appeal the fact-finder's decision because the decision was not received until two days after the deadline to file an appeal. The delay appears to be caused by the postal service. Claimant promptly filed an appeal upon receive of the decision. As such, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

The next issue is whether claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes he was. Benefits are allowed.

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

- 2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:
- a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

- (1) Definition.
- a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition has been accepted by the lowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish

available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Further, the employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

An employee's failure to perform a specific task may not constitute misconduct if such failure is in good faith or for good cause. See Woods v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 327 N.W.2d 768, 771 (Iowa 1982). "[W]illful misconduct can be established where an employee manifests an intent to disobey the reasonable instructions of his employer." Myers v. IDJS, 373 N.W.2d 507, 510 (Iowa 1983) (quoting Sturniolo v. Commonwealth, Unemployment Compensation Bd. of Review, 19 Cmwlth. 475, 338 A.2d 794, 796 (1975)); Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679, 680 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy.

Employer discharged claimant for poor job performance. While poor job performance may be a reason to terminate employment, it does not constitute disqualifying job-related misconduct for unemployment benefit purposes unless it is intentional. There is no evidence that claimant's failure in performing his job was intentional. Therefore, claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The appeal is timely. The October 22, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

Stephanie Adkisson

Stephaned alkesson

Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209 Fax (515)478-3528

<u>January 31, 2022</u> Decision Dated and Mailed

sa/mh